

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

No. 9.

DECEMBER, 1940.

VOL. XXX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

THE ADVENT HOPE.

The Bishop of Chelmsford recently complained publicly that Dr. Dearmer's *Songs of Praise*

'has clearly been compiled to give a weak and reduced view of certain doctrines of paramount importance. This is peculiarly noticeable regarding the doctrines of the Cross and Advent.'

(*Chelmsford Diocesan Chronicle*, p. 107, Sept. 1940.)

It is with Advent that we are now concerned. It is observable that two majestic Advent hymns are conspicuously absent from Dr. Dearmer's collection. They are

*'Dies irae, dies illa,
Solvat saeculum in favilla'*

by Thomas of Celano, and Martin Luther's

'Great God what do I see and hear?
The end of things created:
The Judge of all men doth appear
On clouds of glory seated:
The trumpet sounds, the graves restore
The dead which they contained before;
Prepare, my soul, to meet Him.'

Dr. Dearmer, with his strong aesthetic, dramatic and historic sensitiveness, must have regretted their omission as keenly as do many Modernist Churchmen. But why did he omit them? Simply on the ground that they are, if literally interpreted, incredible. Our view of Advent is no longer that of the mediaeval Church

as portrayed in the Sistine Chapel by Michael Angelo. Archbishop Cranmer and his coadjutors who gave us our incomparable Book of Common Prayer were resolved to remove from the public services of the Church 'many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious.' It was in response to this supreme claim of 'the Truth and nothing but the Truth' that Dearmer made his omissions in compiling his *Songs of Praise*.

From the earliest days of Christianity there have been two views of the Second Advent—the return of Christ to earth. The one view is most fully represented in the magnificent imagery of the *Revelation* or *Apocalypse*—a book which had no little difficulty in securing a place in the Canon of the New Testament, probably because it was the chief authority of the Millenarian heresy. The learned Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, regretted its presence in the New Testament, and many eminent Christian teachers have since shared his disapprobation. We are not of that class. In many ways the Christian religion would have lost much by the exclusion of the *Apocalypse*, but it is plainly a book not to be interpreted literally, which is exactly what the simple and ignorant Christian is naturally inclined to do. What we have called the mediaeval view of the Advent was based on Apocalyptic imagery, which it interpreted literally. It taught that with unexpected suddenness the Archangel's trumpet of world-judgment would sound: the dead would rise from their graves: and Christ, attended by His saints with angels and archangels, would appear in the clouds of heaven, and return to earth to judge mankind and apportion their final destiny to all—eternal life or everlasting torment. Thus would human history terminate on this planet.

We have called this view of the Advent mediaeval, but it is as ancient as Christianity itself—indeed, more ancient, for in substance it goes back to the *Book of Daniel*—a product of Jewish apocalyptic speculations which the primitive Christians took over from the Jews and re-adjusted to the circumstances of primitive Christianity. The great bulk of primitive Christians were convinced of the truth of the Apocalyptic mode of the Advent, and for a century or so after the Crucifixion were in almost immediate expectation that it would be fulfilled literally.

The closing words of the *Apocalypse* voices the ardent expectation of this primitive Advent hope :

‘He which testifieth these things saith,
Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus.’

Age after age passed and no Lord Jesus came in this way to His expectant Church. Many ardent Christians were bitterly disappointed and not a few lapsed. The *Second Epistle of Peter*, probably the latest written book in the New Testament, sought to explain to these disillusioned doubters why ‘the Lord delayeth His coming,’ and to point out to them that it was not due to divine ‘slackness,’ as some men supposed, but to there being a radical difference between human chronology and divine chronology :

‘One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day’ (*II Peter* iii, 8).

Nevertheless there was another class of Christians who doubted, not the truth of the Advent Hope, but whether the popular Christian view of this method of the realization of that Hope was sound. The writer of the Fourth Gospel would himself appear to have come in this class. There are passages in his Gospel which may be interpreted as spiritualizing the popular Christian Eschatology. They clearly teach that Jesus will return in the form of the Paraclete or Comforter entering the hearts of His faithful disciples as the Spirit of Truth, who will carry on the teaching of Jesus and make known to them the many things which Jesus in His ministry could not teach them. And so we have growing up in Christian circles what may be called the spiritual view of the Advent, which regards the Advent of Christ as a spiritual process, punctuated by crises, which began with the proclamation of the Christhood of Jesus on the night of His crucifixion.

It is significant that the reply of Jesus to Caiaphas as recorded in the Greek of *Matthew* xxvi, 64 and *Luke* xxii, 69 supports this spiritual view. The High Priest asked Jesus, ‘Art thou the Son of the Blessed?’ and He replied ‘I am, and *from now onwards* you shall see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of Power and coming in the clouds of heaven.’

This tragic moment initiates the triumphant Advent of Christ to mankind. ‘Now is the Son of Man glorified’ (*John* xiii, 31).

This triumphant Advent of Christ is a process of augmentation in human history. With each passing age the Advent becomes more dynamic and more triumphant. It is manifest in a succession of crises, personal, historical, political, but pre-eminently moral and spiritual — a succession of last hours, a series of *fins de siècle* — and as each crisis culminates the Christian Church may well lift up her head, for the final redemption of humanity is drawing steadily nearer. Hence the primitive Christians who regarded the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the infant Church as a Coming of Christ, and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple by Titus as another Coming of Christ — this time not in mercy but in judgment — exemplify the spiritual method of interpreting post-Crucifixion world-history in the light of the Christian Advent Hope.

This spiritual interpretation is the only sound and convincing way of teaching and presenting the Advent to-day. On the one hand it is credible and cogent, on the other hand it is illuminating and stimulating. Those who hold it are concerned with contemporary reality, historic truth and spiritual experience and the way in which these are interwoven. It is in harmony also with the great ideal of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, of which Kingdom Christ confessed Himself to be the Vice-gerent. The Christ and His Kingdom are not separated. They came on earth together. To individuals it is a personal coming of Christ: to communities and institutions the coming is in the form of movements, cataclysms, crises.

Some of our readers may object that traditional Christianity, in its creeds, in its psalms, in its prayers, in its preaching, cannot have been so grievously mistaken as to the *mode* of Christ's Advent as this spiritual presentation of the Advent suggests. Why not? The Christian Church is not infallible in any except its most essential affirmations. It is fundamentally right in its faith in the *fact* of Christ's Advent. Where it has been wrong is on the secondary issue of the *mode* of that Advent. The Church of the Old Testament as represented by the Judaism of our Lord's day was entirely wrong in its expectation of the *mode* of the Coming of the Messiah. It expected a military conqueror who should break the nations in pieces like a potter's vessel. The Messiah came as no military conqueror, but as a teacher of

moral and spiritual truth—a possible disappointment even to His forerunner. ‘Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me’ (*Matthew xi, 6; Luke vii, 23*). As a consequence contemporary Judaism failed to accept Jesus as its Lord and Leader. Blinded and misled by the false *mode* of its true hope, it was unable to offer him its loyalty.

That is the danger to-day. False traditional teaching about the mode of the Advent which interprets symbolic language as literal fact may compel many modern Christians to disbelieve in the Advent Hope itself. This was the fear of Dr. Dearmer, and it was this which led him to eliminate from his collection those hymns which presented the Advent Hope in this crudely literal and materialistic manner. Dearmer expressed his own faith in the Advent Hope in the following little poem which is published in *Songs of Praise*:

Ah! think not, ‘The Lord delayeth’:
 ‘I am with you,’ still he sayeth,
 ‘Do you yet not understand?’
 Look not back, the past regretting:
 On the Dawn your hearts be setting:
 Rise, and join the Lord’s command.

For e’en now the Reign of Heaven
 Spreads throughout the world like leaven,
 Unobserved, and very near:
 Like the seed when no man knoweth,
 Like the sheltering tree that groweth,
 Comes the Life Eternal here.

Not for us to find the reasons,
 Or to know the times and seasons,
 Comes the Lord when strikes the hour:
 Ours to bear the faithful witness
 Which can shape the world to fitness;
 Thine, O God, to give the power.

A CALL TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATIONISTS.

There was a tendency some years ago in favour of appointing laymen to the Headmasterships in the Public Schools. This was probably due to the fact that a number of our abler masters who might have been ordained felt conscientious objections to becoming ordinands owing to the conflict between the traditional faith and modern knowledge. To-day this tendency happily seems to be diminishing in strength, due probably to the growing

reconciliation between faith and knowledge and the realization that religion, in the form of the Christian religion, is essential for our personal, social, national and international well-being, and that therefore we must have it in its most vital and vigorous form as a factor in character building in our educational systems.

The following letter to the *Times* (Nov. 20), entitled 'The Christian Call,' from the Headmaster of Winchester (until recently a layman) is the product of such convictions :

SIR,

I write on behalf of a special committee formed in the diocese of Winchester to serve in any way open to it the cause of Christian education in this part of England. The committee is representative of the Church of England, the Free Churches, and local administrators ; and it contains also the heads of many different types of school.

Our cause in this war, more perhaps than in any that has preceded it, is spiritual and not simply political. We are convinced that if the Christian Faith is to triumph in England and the world, those who believe in it must agree to postpone the controversies that have divided them and concentrate all their energy upon proclaiming the great simple truths on which happily we are united. We have found among our members the most perfect spirit of co-operation, and the strong conviction that this is the accepted hour in which to claim for the Christian Faith its fundamental place in English education and also in the newly formed youth movement. We have our own loyalties each to his own Church, and this makes it all the easier for us to work with each other. It is our hope that in other parts of England the spirit in which we rejoice here may find the same expression. We believe that thousands of our fellow-countrymen, including many who have before sat loosely to any form of Church membership, are now ready to move at a call from our leaders in the Church and in the State. Once that call is sounded, the nation itself would be astonished at the breadth and volume of the response.

It is not only for all the Churches to join hands. The schools and the universities must take post at their side, and first and most fundamental of all, the homes must do their part. Unless children are taught by word and by the example of their parents what is the Way, the Truth and the Life, the Churches and the universities and the schools, however hard they may try, can seldom make good the opportunity that has been lost earlier. There are thousands of homes in which since the last War this responsibility has been neglected, not out of hostility to Christianity but out of indifference and, worse still, blank ignorance. The storm which we are now facing shows what happens to a nation when it parts company with God. It is therefore the most urgent and compelling task of our time to clear the vision of our people and make them understand what the teaching of the Faith means and what it is ; so that the new England may be built not simply on good intentions but on the Grace of God and the power of Christ.

I am, etc.,

The College, Winchester.

SPENCER LEESON.

November 16th.

It might be thought that only anti-Christians could object to the appeal which this letter makes. We regret, however, that it has called forth a protest, not from the *Literary Guide*, but from the Editor of the *Church Times* (Nov. 29):

‘This letter appears to us to have been composed with enthusiasm rather than judgment. It calls on those interested in education to postpone controversies and to get together on the great simple truths about which all are agreed, so as to preserve the Christian Faith in England. It is for Almighty God, if He pleases, to preserve the Christian Faith in England. The duty of Christians is not to preserve it compromisingly but to preach it unflinchingly. We do not for a moment suppose that Mr. Leeson wants to compromise his, or our, principles. The mischief of such a letter is its vagueness, which is quite certain to be differently interpreted by different readers, and thus to lead only to further misunderstanding and division among Christians.’

What grieves the *Church Times*, apparently, is that the Headmaster of Winchester wishes to unite in the work of Christian education all his fellow-Christians who are educationists. The Editor of the *Church Times* is anxious to keep them denominationally separate lest the emotion of Christian brotherhood should blunt the acuteness of their dogmatic differences and sectarian prejudices.

Yet these are the very things which have done not a little to paganise vast masses of our fellow-countrymen who are now outside all denominations. This war is once again offering the Christian Churches in this land the opportunity which they so dismally missed in the Great War. Should they miss it again, institutional Christianity, as it cannot be mended, will be ended.

THE APOSTOLATE OF PRAYER.

Many will welcome a Roman Catholic co-operative effort for that deepening of the religious life of the nation which our ecclesiastical and even political leaders, including Lord Halifax, have stressed as a necessity if the war in which we are engaged is, in its final issues, to promote the Kingdom of God upon earth. The Roman Catholic effort to which we refer consists in the issue of an attractively printed prayer card¹ which runs as follows:

I believe in one God. I believe that God rewards the good, and punishes the wicked.

¹ Messrs. Mowbrays, W. H. Smith and Sons, 1/- per half dozen, post free.

I believe that in God there are three Divine Persons—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

I believe that God the Son became Man, without ceasing to be God. I believe that He is my Lord and my Saviour, the Redeemer of the human race, that He died on the Cross for the salvation of all men, that He died also for me.

I believe, on God's authority, everything that He has taught and revealed. O my God, give me strong faith. O my God, help me to believe with lively faith.

O my God, Who art all-good and all-merciful, I sincerely hope to be saved. Help me to do all that is necessary for my salvation.

I have committed many sins in my life, but now I turn away from them, and hate them. I am sorry, truly sorry for all of them, because I have offended Thee, my God, Who art all-good, all-perfect, all-holy, all-merciful and kind, and Who died on the Cross for me.

I love Thee, O my God, with all my heart. Please forgive me for having offended Thee.

I promise, O God, that with Thy help I will never offend Thee again.

MY GOD, HAVE MERCY ON ME.

An explanation of the purpose and contents of the card drawn up by Fr. Owen J. Dudley, who has been commissioned by Cardinal Archbishop Hinsley to inaugurate and conduct the Apostolate of the Prayer Card, deserves serious attention. This document is perhaps more remarkable for what it omits than for what it affirms. It makes no reference at all to what members of the Reformed Churches are compelled to regard as the exclusive and intolerant claims of the Papacy: it makes no mention of those doctrines and practices of the Roman Church which members of the Reformed Christian Churches are compelled to regard as superstitious and untrue. It concentrates upon the fundamentals of the Christian faith and worship as held and taught in common with our orthodox Reformed Churches. Fr. Dudley writes of the card:

'It is intended to help all who acknowledge God, to pray rightly. The great majority do not know how to do the only thing that matters at the present time, and in fact, at all times—which is to put themselves right with Almighty God. The Acts of Faith, Hope, Love and Contrition on the card are sufficient by themselves, if sincerely made, to place a person, baptized or unbaptized, in a state of grace. The only true and Christian morale comes from being right with God.'

It will come as a surprise, and a very welcome surprise, to those Christians who, although they value the use of the Christian sacraments, yet have not been able to regard their observance as essentials of the Christian religion, and their non-

observance as de-Christianizing or unchurching those who do not observe them, to learn, on the authority of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, that such persons, provided they pray rightly, are in a state of Grace. While we recognize the merits of this Roman Catholic prayer card in its deliberate exclusion of all controversial and non-essential issues as far as it is possible for a good Roman Catholic to do this, we cannot but feel that the form of prayer which appears on the card must fail to appeal to many English people, and that, not because the card is Christian and they are non-Christian, but because the card is really less Christian than they are themselves. For instance, the card is too individualist in its form of prayer. We recognize that the author's desire is to bring the individual soul into right relations with God, and this accounts for the individualist note which characterizes the whole act of prayer on this card. We doubt the value of this method. Not the least of the lessons which the war is teaching us is that we are members one of another and that no sound national life or personal life can be individualist. It must be social. Hence the Lord's Prayer, the Christian pattern prayer, teaches us to say 'we' not 'I,' 'our' not 'my.' Again, the affirmations of faith in the prayer card extend to matters which are not essential: for instance, 'I believe on God's authority everything that He has taught and revealed.' We all realize what controversies this affirmation raises and what different answers conscientious Christians feel compelled to give to what constitutes the Christian *credenda*. The Catholic creeds provide examples of a better method by teaching those who use them to affirm primarily their trust in and relation to the Divine Father, the Divine Son, and the Divine Spirit. In the practical realization of this trust and this relationship their salvation is found.

The form of the prayer on the card presents yet another difficulty to the modern mind. It is too absolute and too extreme in its declarations. This is a very delicate matter. We know that the language of devotion makes use of such absolutist and rhetorical phrases: nevertheless restraint and strict regard to veracity is what the modern man demands and tries to secure in his prayers. That is why many of the older forms of prayer, beautiful and exalted as they are, seem to him to savour of un-

reality. Such a phrase as 'I love Thee, O my God, with all my heart' is open to criticism on this ground. Who of us does not wish that he might love God with all his heart, but who will dare affirm that he does?

We have not written thus because of a desire to be critical. We wish rather to commend; but we have sought to discover why, well-intentioned and even meritorious as this Roman Catholic effort is, it will fail to make the kind of appeal to a very numerous and widely-dispersed type of modern man and woman which, for instance, can be secured by Kenneth Henderson's *Prayers of Citizenship*.

YOUTH AND THE FUTURE

SELF-PREPARATION

By KENNETH HENDERSON, M.A., B.Litt., author of *Prayers of Citizenship*.

WHAT kind of counsel have the middle-aged to give young people now beginning their working lives? Those careers, so it would seem, must begin and continue in a much troubled world. Human affairs may take a turn for the better after this war, or they may not. We must be prepared at all events for a period of instability, of swift and rough change, of harshness, a time in which, not war perhaps, but fears and menaces, organized and unorganized, will play a larger part in human affairs and make more direct impacts on personal lives than they have done for several centuries. Of course things may be better than that. It is not impossible that a wave of spiritual commonsense may sweep across humanity. But if it does it will be because you and I are ready and qualified to become atoms of effective resolution in that wave. The same kind of preparation is needed for the better possibility as for the worse.

WHY IDEALISTS FAILED

We who were just beginning work at the end of the last war have—or ought to have—something useful to say from our own experience. Generally speaking, the world's affairs have gone wrong not because we were wicked or wanting in goodwill, but because we were not big enough for our problems. We had

ideals all right, and put them into such adventures as the League of Nations and social reforms, and much good work, worth salvage, repair and enlargement, was done. But our ideals were wanting in purity, energy, resolution and technique. We were well aware of the problem of internationalism. We knew that a world in which sixty sovereign nations each thought only of itself would not work. We were aware that the set-up of modern industry required larger economic units, and we preached the liberation of trade. A literature of wisdom was produced in matters political, educational, economic and religious which is worth preserving.

But when it came to action the coarser, more obvious motives of national and sectional selfishness mixed with our enlightenment and their protagonists got most of their way. Ideals seemed nebulous, uncertain, unready with programmes that gripped the moment, lacking solidity compared with what could be held or grabbed. We did not have enough faith in the policies of magnanimity, and did not will the good hard enough. And idealists made the mistake that has tempted the idealist in all ages past and will haunt him to the end of the world—that everlasting blunder of believing that so long as people can be persuaded to mean well, the details are comparatively unimportant and will settle themselves. The fight of light against darkness must be one for control of the passing moment, a fight of working programme against working programme, of detail with detail, here and now.

Then after the last war we lacked mental and moral energy. War is terribly fatiguing to the will and imagination. The young felt disillusioned after those four years. Its leaders had a habit of getting killed. We knew of the difficult and most controversial problems that needed solving, the stupid people that ought to be displaced. But vitality was lacking. It was easier to postpone controversies in the hope that they would settle themselves. To-morrow was also a day. There could not be a war, anyway, as Germany was so weak, and her neighbours surrounded her in overwhelming strength. And so the precious years from 1919 to 1929 were lost, when the world was really malleable. And the depression came and found us and bound us in a hand-to-mouth struggle for existence in which any injury to one's long-distance

neighbour seemed justified so long as it provided a meal for oneself and one's immediate neighbours. We shall not feel the mental and moral fatigue of this war until it ends. See to it that you do not yield to that fatigue, but grasp the moment while it can be shaped. Disillusion is waste of time in every sense. Wisdom in action has real gains to offer at any kind of moment.

MENTAL JUSTICE

Think of your problems in terms of complexity, not of anger. Try for a temper of mental justice. There is a slap-dash tendency abroad to simplify our evils by attributing them to the diabolical machinations of certain groups of people—capitalists, trade union officials (especially in America), bankers, arms manufacturers, politicians, etc. I am not arguing against the need for changes in system, but I doubt the existence of classes of professional devils. That kind of diagnosis is bad-tempered childishness. Why should men who earn their living in the daytime by selling sewing-machines, ice-cream, ham and beef, etc., conspire by night to deprive their fellows of the power to buy these things? British re-armament was delayed, British purchases in the United States hindered, because men who were making a steady living out of razor-blades and steel girders did not want to invest in armaments the capital that, as their last experience showed, would be dead as mutton when the fighting stops.

As for bankers, the latest target, why should persons who make their profit by the briskness and fulness of the inflow and outflow of deposits and finances want to check that flow if they can help it? They have learnt much of the art of central banking in the past ten years. And, despite the exceptional Deterding and Zaharoff, international financiers suffer more from wars than any other class in comparison. Wars don't make for debt-collecting. Where is the money invested in Dawes loans to Germany, League loans to Austria, Russian oilfields? As for trade union leaders, the majority of them have a distinct bias against industrial upheavals. And politicians as a class, as Viscount Grey once pointed out, seek three things—their own advantage, the advantage of their party and the benefit of their country, and these motives vary in order and relative strength in

each one of them. There is plenty of stupidity, fear and selfishness in us all, but not much conscious diabolism. As Meredith wrote :

‘ In tragic life, God wot,
No villain need be ! Passions spin the plot—
We are betrayed by what is false within.’

Anger is much too simple-minded to work well. As a wise German historian, Otto Seeckt, has pointed out, inter-state and class warfare set up a terrible process of ‘inverse selection’ which he calls ‘*die Ausrottung der Besten*’—the rooting out of the best. We fight because we have to in order to get the chance to carry on the work of improving life, and its real problems are all made up of mixed motives and immense technical complexity. How cure unemployment, for instance, by giving men freedom to choose their own work? Finance and currency, international political co-operation of different kinds, technical education, industrial forecasting—these and a dozen other difficulties are elements in the problem. How solve the question of nutrition by making food cheap at one end and securing a fair return to the producers at the other? Another dozen or more difficulties lie between. By hard thinking and patient experiment we can get forward with these tasks, but by no angry simplicity can we ever reconcile finally the perpetually conflicting claims of freedom and tidiness in such issues.

‘NO BETTER THAN OUR FATHERS’

We who were young in 1919 slapped our chests fairly heartily in the assurance that we were a good deal better than our fathers. I wonder. Our trouble was not primarily due, I think, to the facts that we were enlightened persons with senile nincompoops pulling us back from behind, and hidden devils to fight in front. Our trouble was just the everlasting mixture of motives in ourselves and others. All reforming realism must begin by facing squarely the fact of ‘original sin’—the tendency in ourselves, as in others, to be lazy, selfish and short-sighted, angry and narrow, impatient and easily defeated. Every reforming realist must get down solidly to the business of his own redemption. Freedom and democracy, for example, depend for their survival on the ability of different kinds of people to keep their tempers with each other. It is not natural to have goodwill towards

people who think and live differently from oneself. Other people's differences imply a challenge and criticism of how one lives and thinks. It is not natural to forgive wrongs, personal or national, and to will the good of critics and enemies. It is not natural to preserve one's courage and persistence through defeats and frustrations. With Toynbee, Joad, Lionel Curtis and others I believe that the solution of this basic problem of redemption must be sought in enlightened religion—the admission of power from beyond the self. No external situation can be so oppressive and so black as to deprive us of the power of creative wisdom. But that personal wisdom must have roots deep below the passing facts to withstand the shocks of opposition and defeat. It must be high enough to give us a perspective and patience above the passing storms. It must, in short, be character and faith of religious quality. Plato directs our eyes to the 'heavenly goods' as those on which 'human goods depend, and not having which, States lose both.'

Men, different, hostile and unfair, can be seen and served as fellow-children of God, to be forgiven because we ourselves so need forgiveness. Courage and integrity can be preserved if we believe that our shattered and more or less frustrated programmes are imperfect expressions of an eternal wisdom striving to reveal itself out of the heart of things. Energy can be maintained if we open ourselves to the power and enthusiasm that strives to penetrate our fluctuating moods. Energy, says Joad, is the characteristic and indispensable gift of religion. Here in high and useful form is the danger and excitement that some men need. The religious man serves his ideals, not by the reckoning of success or failure, but because such service is his uprightness before God. The data we work with, the situation around us, can never be so black and oppressive as to take from us the power to acquit ourselves with honour and goodwill. The turmoil can never thunder so loud as to drown out the counsel of God if we listen for it. Nor need we despair at the apparent hopelessness of awakening the 'little man' to the largeness of life's issues. We have seen enormous changes set in motion by a few people who believed intensely in forces that seem to us devilish. God also can save the people by a 'remnant' who take the trouble to know what they are doing.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD AND SACRAMENTS

By CANON A. L. LILLEY, author of *Modernism and Prayer in Christian Theology*, etc.

THE Church is the worshipping community. Its life is in its worship, in the communion of its members through its worship. Now when we speak or think casually of worship, we have in our minds, I think, a purely human act. We offer our worship to God. We offer our prayers or our praise to Him and that offering is our worship. Then we suddenly remember that the sacraments are a constituent part of all fully Christian worship, and reflect that they at least are something which we simply receive. And the habit of mind grows up in which we distinguish sharply between prayer and praise and the like which are our offering, and the Word and Sacraments which are God's gift. Now this separation in thought between what God does and what we do in worship is ruinous to its conception as an act of the community. And the first and the last thing to be remembered about Christian worship is that it is an act of the community, and the act of its individual members only in virtue of their membership in the community. But the Christian community is formed by the organic union of its Divine Head with its human members. Its life is the reality of communion between its Head and its members. Its worship is at once the expression and the sustenance of that communion. So far therefore from God and man being separated in worship, it is only by reason of their organic union in Christ that worship is possible. And as the head has the direction and control of every movement of the body, so in the community which is the Body of Christ every movement of its life comes from Him. Its acts of faith and prayer are equally His gifts with the Word and Sacraments. Hence the uniform contention of theology that the act of faith which seems such a uniquely personal act is really a Divine gift to man. Hence, too, that sublime commonplace of theology: 'It is not man but God in man who prays.' The prayer which is not according to the known will of God, which is not inspired by His will, is not true prayer at all. But if the impulse to and the

power of worship in the Christian community come from its Head, it does not follow and it is not true that the members have no active share in it. The analogy between the natural body and the spiritual body is imperfect and incomplete and may be most misleading. In the natural body the obedience of the members to the direction of the head is automatic. In the spiritual body this is far from being the case. It is the essential character of its life that the power which derives from the Head to each member is a trust and exists in each member as his or her very own. It may be misused or neglected, and so become an actual principle of spiritual decay. The last state of that man will be worse than the first. Or it may be used to become a principle of growth towards the fulness of life in the Head. In the spiritual society it does not follow that because the Head has given, each member will receive what has been given to him. It is the tragic mystery of the spiritual life that it is so easy not to receive its gifts and so very difficult to receive them, and the more difficult the higher those gifts are. Reception in the spiritual order means making that which is received one's very own, making it the sovereign principle of the personal life. It is not only the highest, but the most arduous and exacting activity of the soul. Faith is a Divine gift—yes, but a gift which can be received and kept only by an intensive self-discipline. Even to think of the Divine gifts as capable of a merely passive reception is to misunderstand their nature and annul their power.

In the worship of the community, therefore, there is always a twofold movement and activity. It is an act both of the Divine Head and of the human members. But it is one act in which both share. To say that worship is an act of the community is the same thing as saying that it is the act of communion between Head and members, and that communion is maintained and increased through acts of worship. In those acts the Divine and human activities coalesce, grow increasingly into each other and lose even a conceivable separateness. Here, it is true, words must betray the thought they are intended to express. For the Divine activity which initiated the communion between the Head and the members is, by reason of its perfection, incapable of less or more, while man's active share in it must, by reason of his imperfection, be necessarily a growth from less to more. And

this would seem to introduce a separateness, if not in idea at least in fact, between the partners in the act of worship. Yet we can remember for our comfort that the Head of the community which worships is Christ; *i.e.*, the Divine Perfection, as it has voluntarily assumed humanity, has freely and fully entered into the feeling of our infirmities. Of such a Head we may surely be authorized to think as accommodating the pace, as it were, of His activity to ours without any, even the least, compromise of its Divine perfection. He is active in the community, inspiring in its human members an ever higher and higher measure of spiritual activity, and yet—I must use the expression, however daring, again—all the time keeping pace with their activity. Thus worship can grow in sincerity and depth without ceasing for a moment to be the closest communion of Divine and human action; or rather, only thus can it grow.

I have thought this preliminary discussion of the nature of worship essential to any sufficient understanding of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments to the congregation of the faithful. The account of its nature which I have just attempted is determined entirely by the conception of it as an act (or, if you like, a function) of the Christian community—the act, indeed, or the function in which the life-principle of the community finds fullest expression and by which its vigour is most fully nourished and sustained. No theologian, I think, would either deny the fact that worship is an act of the community or deny the importance of the fact. Yet systematic theology in its treatment of the subject seems to me to have too often taken inadequate account of this cardinal fact. On the whole, strange as it may sound to many fixed preconceptions, the reproach falls most lightly upon Protestant theology, whether Evangelical or Reformed. It is mediaeval theology especially that has been satisfied with a very one-sided treatment. In the *Summa* of St. Thomas, for instance, worship is treated almost incidentally as a part of his general treatment of the virtue of justice. This almost casual method of approach to a subject the most central to the life of the Christian community is sufficiently strange, but its implications are stranger still. In the first place, if worship is only a particular instance of one of the human virtues, it can hardly be described or even conceived as an act of the Christian community. The only possible

subject of a virtue is an individual soul. Only an individual can acquire or possess virtue or *a* virtue. Even if, by the figure of speech which we call metonymy, virtue is assigned to the community, it can only be to the community as the sum of the individuals who numerically compose it. But no community is merely the sum of its members, and the Christian community least of all. Every community is constituted by the common idea or purpose which has brought its members together. And in the case of the Christian community it is something very much more than an idea which has drawn its members together and formed them into a common life, *viz.* the personal presence in action of its Divine-human Head. But, secondly, it is stranger still to find that, if worship is to be thought of as a particular instance of virtuous human action, the virtue illustrated by it should not even be one of the theological virtues (faith, hope and charity) but one of the four cardinal virtues (prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance). For as the theological virtues are Divine gifts of the supernatural order, and as their exercise by human souls depends on their being implanted in that order, it might still be possible to speak in a somewhat forced sense of the community as virtuous, since it is through its Divine Head the source and sustenance of these virtues. But the cardinal virtues are part of the natural law written in the hearts of all men, pagan and Christian alike, and more nobly exemplified in the lives of many pagans than in the lives of many even good Christians. Yet it is under the category of one of these virtues, that of justice, that St. Thomas places worship. For him worship is an act of natural justice. For justice means giving to each his due—*jus suum cuique*, *i.e.* giving to each that to which he has a natural right. Now, God and God alone has a natural right to worship, to *latría*, from all His creatures. Therefore in offering intelligent worship to God, man is performing an act of justice.

Now St. Thomas is here clearly considering worship exclusively from the point of view of the share which the individual members of the community have and must have in it. It is a point of view which is all-important. For, as I have insisted already, the share of the individual members in the communal worship is nothing if it is not a genuine activity. The grace which

makes worship possible cannot be received merely passively; and therefore for each member of the community worship is an obligation and therefore also a virtue. St. Thomas is also quite justified in holding that this virtue is a part or an instance of the general virtue of justice. It is, so far as the individual is concerned, the offering to God of that which is His due. Again, considering worship only from the point of view of the individual's offering of it, he is probably justified, too, in his contention that it is not a theological virtue. He points out that by the theological virtue of faith, for instance, we actually adhere to God. Faith is not the mere belief that God exists, but a belief in God — not the mere *credere Deum*, but the *credere Deo*. God is the immediate object of faith, and through faith we actually attain to God as its object. *Credendo Deo, Deum attingimus*. But according to St. Thomas, in worship we do not attain to God. Those acts by which we pay the honour and reverence due to God are only the matter, the *materia*, directed towards their end, not the attainment of the end itself. And as the distinction between the theological and the natural virtues lies just in this, that the latter are means directed towards an end while the former reach the end directly, worship is not a theological but a natural virtue, one instance of the natural virtue of justice.

But even if it be freely admitted, as I think it must, that worship on the part of the individual members of the community is the discharge of a debt towards God, and that as such it is an instance of the natural human virtue of justice, it still remains to consider how the individual members acquired the knowledge of this duty. Did they acquire it by the law of nature graven in their hearts of which justice, the *jus suum cuique*, is an essential part? To assert that is to assert also that all men have a natural knowledge of God, a position which, though it may be true, is not easy to reconcile with the belief that the only true knowledge of God is revealed. And even if God can be known by the light of natural reason, the God of Christian worship at least is known only by His revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. However true it may be, therefore, that the worship of God *when known* becomes an obligation and demand of justice, it is simply not true that any such obligation or demand exists before He has made Himself known. It would seem, therefore, that Christian

worship is not possible apart from revelation and faith, and that thus, if it is a virtue, it is so as a part, and as an indivisible and essential part, of the theological virtue of faith. When faith has made good its claim, and only then, can worship be recognized as an obligation and demand of justice.

So then we come back to our original position that worship within the economy of the Christian Revelation is intelligible only as an act of the community of which Christ is the Head, and of its members only as they are in vital communion with Him, *i.e.* only in the proportion that they assimilate and make their own His inspiration. And the best witness to this Christian conception of worship is the uniform practice of the worshipping congregation. The worshipping Church is the congregation of the faithful in which the Word is duly proclaimed and the Sacraments duly administered. That is to say, its worship consists primarily in receiving that which has been Divinely given. It has sought to honour and reverence God by waiting upon His words and receiving His gifts; and because receiving the Divine gifts involves an arduous and sustained personal discipline, each member of the community in receiving them has his or her own active share in its worship. The ministry of the Word and Sacraments, *i.e.* the giving and receiving of them, has always been recognized as the heart and soul of Christian worship. But it is principally on the receiving of them that we need to concentrate our attention, because receiving is the part of every single member of the worshipping congregation, both of him who ministers the Divine gifts and of those to whom they are ministered through him. Let us think first of the ministry of the Word. The Word is received only through an intensive meditation upon it. To hear the Word means, first of all, to experience the awe of listening to the authentic voice of God. It is to meditate deeply upon the holiness of the Divine Nature from which the Word proceeds. On the part of the minister it is to prepare himself by such meditation to proclaim the Word to himself and to others, to proclaim it in the congregation of which he is one. Such initial meditation is the withdrawal from all outside interests, almost from all external perception, into the hushed mood of awed expectancy which can receive the Divine Word. It is the 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.' It is the atmosphere of

worship which all the worshippers alike must breathe. And as an atmosphere it must remain to envelop the whole act of worship. It must accompany and inspire the meditation which is to come upon the Word itself. For the hearing or reading of the Word have meaning only as they become a meditation upon its contents as a personal message from God to each hearer or reader. The preaching of the Word is directed specially to the evocation and guidance of such meditation. Hence the importance traditionally attached to the preaching of the Word in the worship of the community. Hence, too, the traditional method of preaching in which the ministers of the Word, in the Roman, Evangelical and Reformed Communions alike, have been carefully trained from generation to generation and which persists with little change to this day. It is a method directed first of all to a discipline of self-suppression in the preacher. Only in so far as he identifies himself with the Word which he preaches must he allow his own personality to be felt in what he says. He must speak throughout as the messenger of Another, sedulously exercising and cultivating the restraint upon himself which that character involves. He is there no doubt to interpret the message of Scripture, but in his interpretation he is trained to conform as far as possible to the meanings which have become traditional and accepted throughout the Christian community. As his sermon is a meditation upon the Word and a guide to the meditation of the faithful, he is carefully indoctrinated in a method of arranging it which long experience has proved to be most conducive to that end. He is taught to begin with an exordium in which the portion of Scripture which he has chosen is presented to the congregation of the faithful there assembled as God's message expressly delivered to them and awaiting their reception through their intent meditation upon it. He then clearly states the points of the message on which they are to meditate with him, and winds up his exordium with what is sometimes in form but always in effect a prayer for the Divine guidance in his momentous task. He is now ready to enter upon a separate treatment of the points which he has announced in the exordium. The whole sermon is thus a series of meditations, each growing by an easy and natural transition out of its predecessor, and all reunited and enforced anew in the conclusion.

This is the traditional scheme of the sermon as an integral element in the act of Christian worship. It will be seen that its sole purpose is to help the congregation to hear and receive the Divine message, to hear and meditate intently upon it only as Word of God.

But this character of the sermon depends upon certain conditions and can be fully preserved only where and when those conditions persist. It depends, first of all, on an explicit and unquestioning belief in the letter of Holy Scripture as the Word of God. The letter, indeed, presented innumerable difficulties from the beginning. From the time of Origen onwards theologians have been engaged in exploring the hidden meanings of Scripture. But throughout all this labour of interpretation the belief remained firm, unwavering, universal that God had chosen the letter of Scripture as the form of His revelation. In putting forward their allegorical and other interpretations, theologians were careful to insist that those interpretations had authority only in so far as they were really contained in the letter and legitimately derived from it. Many such interpretations, indeed, came to be accepted universally as the real meaning contained in the letter; but they were always offered, in St. Thomas' phrase, *salva literae circumstantia*—subject to the Divine authority of the letter itself. The letter was the form in which God had given His Word. No one recognized what we have grown accustomed to call a human element in the Bible. When Bossuet said that what we see in the Bible is human, what we believe in it is alone Divine, he meant only, as he expressly tells us, that God had condescended to use human words and imagery as the medium of His Revelation, and especially that He had condescended to use the barbarous Latin of the Vulgate as that medium. But when in Bossuet's own day the Oratorian, Richard Simon, the founder of modern Biblical criticism, proclaimed to the world the existence of a really human element in the Bible, no one was more shocked than Bossuet at the enormity of the offence to Christian faith. Bossuet was fully justified in his intuition of the new menace to and the new difficulties for Christian faith involved in the critical scholarship of the great Oratorian. It was indeed nearly two centuries before his pioneer work had developed into a conception of the human element in the for-

mation and therefore in the character of the Bible which was accepted by the most orthodox scholars of the Christian world. And it was longer still before the process of infiltration of the new conception among the general body of educated Christian people had seriously begun. But when and as it did, everything was changed. The glad confident morning of faith, the unhesitating assurance that in hearing or reading the Scriptures the hearer or reader was listening to the undiluted Word of God, had departed and could not be regained. The worm of doubt had crept into the worshipping body. And so the ministry of the Word has fallen upon evil days. Its foundations are shaken, its coping-stone removed. The congregation can no longer be regarded as an assembly bound together in expectation of the Word of God and meditation upon it. The minister of the Word knows that there is division in its ranks, and the congregation knows that there is division and confusion in the ranks of the ministry, and that on the question which is the most fundamental of all for the faith of both. The minister, knowing that he is speaking to many who are shaken in the faith and yet ardently wish to regain it, turns aside almost perforce from his appointed task of delivering the Divine Word and devotes himself to explaining instead in what sense it is to be taken as the Word of God. From the minister of the Word he has become an apologist, and apologetics is the last refuge of the believer. And in so far as preaching undertakes this task — a task which is certainly not its own, but is now in greater or less degree forced upon it — it seems only to accentuate the division in the ranks of the congregation which already exists. Part of it will accuse the preacher of betraying the faith, and another part will flout his apologetics as blundering or inadequate or insincere. In short, there can be no real and effective ministry of the Word where there is not an antecedent community of faith in the Word. Preaching cannot regain its ancient power until it can confidently resume its ancient function, and it can only do so when a consensus of Christian opinion as to what is that Word of God which is the object of Christian faith has been recovered. That must be a slow and gradual process, but it is no mere chimerical hope. The difficulties of the past, it is true, were very different in character from those which confront us now, but they were as

real and as grave. They were, as we have seen, differences in the interpretation of what was obscure in Holy Scripture regarded as integrally the Word of God. Those differences were overcome by the gradual formation of a consensus of opinion as to what the right interpretation was. Our difficulties are of another kind. They are difficulties of selection in a Divine-human literature of what is really Word of God. That selection can only be accomplished by an apprehension of faith, by what I would call a faith-criticism of the Scriptures. That is to say, it will not be a selection, necessarily arbitrary, of certain portions of Scripture as Divine and the rejection of others as merely human, but the apprehension by faith of what is really Word of God through the human forms and apprehensions in which all of it alike was given. And it would be unreasonable to suppose that this faith-criticism will be unequal to its task or will fail gradually to reach a consensus of opinion as to what is Word of God in the Scriptures, just as of old a consensus of interpretation was gradually reached. And we need not even wait for the consummation of the process in order to regain the old community of worship in receiving the Word and the old function and power of preaching in delivering it. When we have once recognized this faith-criticism as a method, and have pledged ourselves to the diligent application of it, we shall at once have recovered at least the conditions for a renewed community in worship.

Meanwhile worship, at least in our own communion, is supporting itself almost exclusively on its other ministry of the Sacraments, and especially of the Sacrament of the Altar. Here at least is that fulness of communion in faith, in anxious expectancy, in devout reception of the Divine gifts, which is the soul of worship. Yet these two ministries ought not to be disjoined, for they are in fact not two ministries but one. They are one and the same Revelation in two modes. As Augustine somewhere puts it in stressing their oneness, sacraments are the visible Word, by which he seems to mean that as the Word of God is revealed in the hearing of Scripture through words, which are audible signs, so also is it revealed in the Sacraments through visible signs. In the Christian conception of the worship of the *congregatio fidelium* they have always been conjoined as its vital principle, the Divine Revelation in word and action, the

community of response to which is Christian worship. And in practice the preaching of the Word has very generally been an integral element of the Eucharistic service. Throughout the churches of the Roman obedience that practice has always prevailed, though the preaching of the Word on other occasions of worship as well has long since become common. In the Lutheran and Anglican communions the same thing holds good. The authorized place for the sermon is in the Communion office, whether the office is completed by the acts of consecration and communion or not. And now among the neo-Calvinists, who have so signally revived not only the theology of the Reformed Churches of the Continent but their worship also, it is being strenuously contended that no act of Christian worship is complete which does not begin with the administration of Baptism, proceed to the preaching of the Word, and conclude with the Holy Communion. It is of course recognized that such acts of worship are not generally or even often possible. But they would represent the true ideal of worship in that they would re-enact in the congregation the whole course of the Christian life as generated, taught and nurtured by the Word made flesh.

In thus making the ministry of the Word and Sacraments the sum and substance of Christian worship, and in conjoining them so closely in thought and practice that no act of worship is regarded as quite complete in which either ministry is wanting, the Church is bearing witness to its double character of *communio sanctorum* and of *congregatio fidelium*. It can claim to be the communion of saints only because it is constituted in its Divine Head, because it is the Body of which Christ is the Head, the sole source and sustainer of its life. To this the ministry of the Word and Sacraments bears fullest witness. In Word and Sacraments He is continually and unceasingly revealing His power, or rather His actual presence, within the community. Its worship is the continual proclamation and announcement of His presence. But it must be something more, *viz.* the reception of His power by the individual members of the community, a reception which can never be passive but demands the most active and unremitting discipline of the Christian life. Only in the proportion that the Divine gifts are thus received does the Church become also a congregation of the faithful.

Yet if Word and Sacraments are thus closely conjoined as revelations of the Divine presence and power in the community, evoking and enabling its worship, it does not follow that each has not its own distinctive status and value. They are at least two different modes of that revelation. In the Word God speaks. His message comes through human words and as such makes its appeal to the intelligence. And the human intelligence can never be equal to the acceptance of all that is contained in the Divine Revelation. Even when the heart attaches itself in faith to the Revelation of the Word, it can receive it only in conceptual terms which are always grossly inadequate. That is the reason why in an age like this, which has been forced to face this special limitation of the Divine Revelation through the Word, faith has begun to hesitate or even to despair before the magnitude and perplexity of its task. And if it still remains eager and constant in its search for God, it turns naturally for the satisfaction of its need to that other mode of Revelation represented in the Sacraments. For in the Sacraments God comes to man in a way that seems to transcend the intelligence, to be independent of it altogether. For faith He speaks there, not through the medium of human words, but in the power of His own immediate presence. Through certain visible signs that Presence is recognised and received by the faithful. The Sacraments are just this mode of Revelation, beyond the strife of tongues and the hesitations of the intellect, in which faith can again find a secure and satisfying refuge. In its sense of security, however, it fails to remember how momentary that security must be if it is not guaranteed by the Word and by faith derived from and sustained by the Word. Faith in the Sacraments is necessarily built upon the foundation of faith in the Word. It may be conceded that the Sacraments are the higher, the more immediate, and above all the more personal mode of God's saving Revelation of Himself to man. But man's faith in, even his knowledge of, that mode is dependent upon the antecedent faith which he derived from the revelation through the Word. Especially for the worship of the congregation, for the integrity of its intention and effort, is it essential that these two complementary modes of the Divine Revelation and of human faith in it should again be firmly established in their relation of mutual interdependence.

AND NOW—WHAT?

By J. C. HARDWICK, M.A., B.Sc., Vicar of Partington.

AT present a moratorium on all intellectual problems—at least those of an academic nature—has been declared, and meanwhile we may cast up our accounts to see how we shall stand when the moratorium ends. It seems unlikely that we shall take up the problems just where we laid them down, or hurriedly dropped them.

Where were we when the war began? What had been the results of our studies, biblical, critical, historical? Perhaps Loisy's *Naissance du Christianisme* more or less summarized the situation so far as the history of the origins of Christian institutions and doctrines were concerned. And as for New Testament studies, the problems and their provisional solutions are succinctly stated in Professor and Mrs. Kirsopp Lake's recent work.¹ The inquirer directed to these two volumes would soon put himself in possession of the results of the most recent inquiries in these fields. No doubt here and there are gaps to be filled or modifications to be made; but on the whole the goal of historical certainty has been reached, so far as that is possible in a region where much important material is necessarily missing.

When so much has been achieved, what may be the next item on the programme? Doubtless many an active mind will be engaged on dexterous attempts either to discredit the results of objective research or to square them with traditional ideas. Yet on the long view such work, however ingenious, and however inspired by sincere motives, must be accounted a waste of time, and it is to be hoped that not too many of the post-war generation will allow themselves to be entrapped into it. There is no need to belittle the importance of the work done and the spirit of heroic sincerity in which it was achieved. It was not only an intellectual but a religious need that prompted scholars, often to the prejudice of their professional prospects, to seek to penetrate behind the facade of traditional ideas covering the

¹ *An Introduction to the New Testament*. By Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. (1938).

facts of history. But it is a task which is now, if not completed, yet well on the way to completion; and the 'mopping up' process need not worry us unduly. We should now allow ourselves to envisage other and new problems which are arising. Fresh tasks await us.

To the question what these may be the religious idealist has his answer ready, and the blessed word 'reconstruction' will spring to his lips. He will urge that academic problems should be abandoned in favour of social and economic problems, and is anxious for religious leaders to devote their energies to building 'a new world.' Altogether apart from the desirability of such a new world, such a programme will appeal strongly to persons who are itching to get down to practical tasks. To be engaged on such tasks brings a strong sense of satisfaction, especially perhaps to those whose minds are enveloped in fog. A practical job is often a great comfort to the man who is afraid or reluctant to think. Especially is this apt to be the case with clergymen who are tempted to accept the world's estimate of their proper function as rather useless and unpractical.

Yet it is highly doubtful whether these lauded practical tasks (which certainly have to be done by someone) are really the proper business of religious leaders; they can more safely be left to persons trained to perform them, officials, business men, technicians, and even politicians. The rôle of the religious leader should surely be to supply these men of the world with the moral and religious dynamic that will make them tackle their jobs in the right spirit. Supplying such a dynamic is not the easiest task in the world. Those who are to supply this needful tonic must have moral influence, and how is that to be earned? It is doubtful whether our religious leaders, however laudable their motives and however unquestioned their sincerity, have the complete confidence of the public. The public treats them with respect, but at the same time does not take them quite seriously. They are felt, somehow, to stand at a few removes from reality. They hope, no doubt, that preoccupation with practical tasks will persuade the public of their close contact with reality. But credit for being in contact with reality cannot be earned solely by being immersed in practical work. Practical

jobs may actually be a screen to shut out reality if immersion in them precludes thought, as it may easily do. The religious guide should give guidance, and to enable him to do this he must have an insight into reality, and into principles, that practical work of itself cannot give. The ship's officer who should spend his watch on deck peeling potatoes for the cook might be a good-natured fellow, but he would not be an efficient officer. By becoming practical men our religious guides may be lowering themselves in the public estimation; they will be regarded as good fellows, but not as persons possessing exceptional moral and spiritual insight, which is the kind of reputation it should be their ambition to earn.

Thus the programme for the immediate future, if it should not be the further scrutiny of historical and critical problems, ought not to be simply an evasion of these by immersion in the practical problems of building a new world. That is altogether too facile a policy. There are plenty of people to take on that job; what these people need most is what we may call moral and spiritual guidance. Of this there is a shortage, and the new task we have in mind is to create a reservoir of persons from whom such guidance can be drawn. What we really need is some guidance as to what kind of a world we should attempt to build. At the moment our official religious guides can tell us little we cannot hear equally well from journalists, belletrists, politicians, radio oracles. They have no surer grasp of reality, no deeper insight, no more (perhaps less) creative imagination. They add a few pious and edifying phrases to the mixture they offer us, but the substance of it is the same as that prescribed by the men of the world. We are entitled to expect more than this.

It may seem unduly fanciful to suggest that the most urgent task that lies before us is the provision of individuals who have it in them to give genuine religious, moral, and spiritual guidance. It would certainly be admitted that there is at present a clear shortage of such persons. Cannot systematic efforts be made to devise methods of training whereby moral and spiritual insight may be developed? Is such an idea altogether absurd?

The objections to such a hope or such an undertaking are

obvious. We shall be reminded that 'the wind bloweth where it listeth,' that moral and spiritual insight are gifts bestowed more or less at random, and that in any case it is impossible by taking thought to add a cubit to any man's stature; and not only impossible but impious. But with regard to this latter point we have to remember that in times past the enlargement of his physical perceptions by man was regarded as presumptuous. There were those who hesitated to look through Galileo's telescope for fear they should see Satan at the other end. Yet Saturn's rings and the satellites of Venus have done us no harm. Why then should an attempt to extend the range of man's spiritual perceptions be dangerous? 'Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil,' may be taken as words of encouragement and not only as words of warning.

And the question is too important to be closed abruptly by any appeal to *a priori* notions as to what is and what is not possible for human nature. It is true that Professor Arnold Toynbee voiced a widely held opinion when he said in his Burge Memorial Lecture in Oxford :

'There has been no perceptible variation in the average sample of human nature in the past; there is no ground, in the evidence afforded by History, to expect any great variation in the future either for better or for worse.'

But yet it is true (whatever may be the case with regard to 'the average sample') that there have been periods when exceptional individuals possessing supernormal spiritual insight, and therefore capable of supplying genuine moral and spiritual guidance, have existed; we may take the seventh century B.C. as an example. What caused the emergence of the Hebrew prophets of that period? Whence came the tradition they inherited, and which they enriched and passed on? And how was it that a period of rich spiritual endowment was succeeded by one of comparative spiritual poverty? Was it all a matter of chance and accident? To say that the source of their inspiration was God or His Holy Spirit is no answer, since it does not explain why these individuals were uniquely able to tap that source of enlightenment. Why was it that they, and not others, had ears to hear the divine voice? The presence in men of such varying

degrees of spiritual perception is itself a phenomenon that calls for explanation. And may there not be discoverable methods whereby this spiritual sensitiveness may be increased?

It is difficult to resist the impression that the Hebrew prophets, certainly at the earlier period of Elijah and Elisha, were in possession of certain techniques of training whereby super-normal faculties of prevision and telepathy were developed. Unless indeed the stories related in the books of Kings about these singular men are devoid of historical foundation. It is true that one may have powers of prevision and telepathy without possessing great moral and spiritual insight; on the contrary, those powers can doubtless be attained by bad men as well as good, and we may be pretty sure that the prophets of Baal possessed them in some measure or they would never have had any following. But that is not the point. The point is that in times past methods of training were in use whereby certain mental faculties were developed to a marked degree, and there is no good reason to deny the possibility of moral and spiritual insight being developed by parallel or similar methods. Otherwise, how account for the existence of the seventh century prophets, except on some theory of inexplicable accident?

We no longer know what were the disciplines involved; doubtless there was a somewhat drastic degree of ascetic practice. It is true that this goes against the modern prejudice that the ordinary hearty eupeptic and, if possible, athletic person is the surest guide in spiritual matters. But the tradition of every generation save our own has been against this view; and though our generation may be ahead of its predecessors in some things, few would claim that it possesses greater spiritual insight. It is true that ascetic practices have been at times exalted as ends in themselves, but we are in little danger of that nowadays. The danger now is that all rigorous self-discipline should be regarded as 'morbid'—a blanket term covering everything that the modern hearty person does not understand.

Reference was made above to the achievements of critical and historical research. The chief result of this has not been to reduce all the wonderful happenings and revelations of the past to the level of our own rather limited understanding, but to show

that nothing has ever happened, even in the most creative periods of the past, but what might equally well happen to-day if conditions could be reproduced. It is the knowledge how to reproduce them that is lacking. But is such knowledge unattainable; can it not be rediscovered by experiment? 'He that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.' How about this as a programme for the future?

It is only too true that our pietists have queered the pitch rather badly for us. They have taken away the key of knowledge, and those that have sought to enter in they have hindered. They have taken such activities as prayer, contemplation and meditation, and interpreted and used them in terms of, and within the limits of, their own particular views of the divine dispensations. Often they have been hostile to any religious activities which might seem to run counter to their own sacramentarian practice, around which immense vested interests have clustered. For this reason the late Dom Chapman's work was attacked by the Jesuits, for this reason the Quietists were persecuted in the seventeenth century. Constant obsession with traditional theory and practice has also led to the pietists being unoriginal and imitative. All this has tended, no doubt with too little reason, to discredit the life of religion among the more vital elements in the community. But as the present age, under stress of circumstances, is becoming markedly less extrovert in attitude, realizing now the importance of the inner side of life, religious practices may begin to be taken with more of the seriousness which they deserve.

A generation or so ago there was widespread interest in the psychology of religion, synchronizing with the appearance of a notable work by the late Professor William James. This helped people to see that religion was a normal form of human activity — as much so as science or art. But the attitude of psychologists remained too detached; their view was an 'outside' one, and when Freud introduced his theories, religion was written off as a form of neurosis. This was only one more indication of our tendency to interpret everything, big as well as little, in terms of the poverty-stricken experience of the average 'hearty' person. But there has been a little too much psychology; it is

as if our young people studied the psychology of sex to the prejudice of practical lovemaking. What we now need is not the psychology, but the practice, of religion. And this practice needs to be put on a scientific footing. This is where psychology can come in. This is a task for the immediate future; and if it is carried through successfully, there will be no need to seek to 'build a new world,' for that world will build itself.

It is, of course, one thing to suggest a programme of research and another thing to carry it out. The writer of this article takes the view that academic, historical and critical studies have reached some conclusions that can be accepted by all whose primary motive is to ascertain the truth rather than to shore up tradition. This leads him to believe that the time is ripe to switch off from the past on to the present, and to study the *practice* of religion with a view to putting it upon a scientific basis. The preliminaries to this are (1) a study of psychological conditions favourable to the actual practice of religion, and (2) the devising of new or the recovery of old methods and techniques of religious practice. Such writers as Jung, Adler, Freud have dealt with the first section, and there is work going on in the second sphere which does not at present attract a great deal of public attention. In the view of the writer the future of civilization is largely dependent upon a redirection of human activity. We can already control the exterior world, but over the interior world of our own natures we have perhaps less control than of yore, and our ideas of the nature and possibilities of the world of spirit are limited in the extreme. As was said above, the writer feels no special competence to contribute anything of importance to the two spheres indicated. But by way of experiment, and to arouse interest in the subject, he will, with the Editor's consent, contribute two further articles on the topics mentioned.

WORSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST

ITS ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE

BY THE EDITOR.

I.

THE younger Pliny in his famous letter¹ to Trajan, written about 111 A.D., informs the Emperor that he learnt from his cross-examination of apostate Bithynian Christians, confirmed it would appear by the evidence of two loyal Christian deaconesses under torture, that it was the custom of the Christians 'on a fixed day to assemble before daylight and sing antiphonally a hymn to Christ as a God' (*carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*).

What is the significance of this worship of Jesus Christ and what is its justification?

The worship of the Divine Father in the Christian religion does not to-day create difficulty in theory, at any rate for the thoughtful Christian, but the worship of Jesus as God does for many create a real difficulty. If it be asked 'Why?' the answer would probably be twofold:

- (1) That Jesus taught His disciples to worship the Divine Father, and He Himself practised this worship of the Father: He never taught them to worship Himself.
- (2) That Jesus was a man, and that man is not a proper object of divine worship.

The traditional defence that Jesus is worshipped not because He is man but because He is God carries little weight to-day. That is because the traditional cut and dried proofs of His Godhead, such as His miraculous birth, resurrection and ascension, His superhuman acts, His fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, etc., have become out-moded. Our real need in this matter is to secure a clearer understanding of what precisely

¹ *Epp.* x, 96.

is meant by worship of Jesus Christ and what is the significance and validity of such worship viewed in the light of our modern studies of religion.

II.

In the light of these modern studies of religion, the term 'worship' includes a vast range and variety of religious emotions extending, for instance, from abject terror, that fear which, as the Latin poet, Lucretius, affirmed created the gods, to that perfect love of God which St. John declares has cast out all fear (I *John* iv, 18). For the disciple of St. John, worship assumes the form of that personal communion with the Divine which culminates in adoration, wonder and delight. This realization of the Divine Presence constitutes for the mystics—Christian and non-Christian—the highest kind of religious worship. It is accompanied by a number of other religious emotions. For instance, in Augustine's *Confessions* we find it accompanied by penitent regret that in his eager pursuit of life's pleasures he had failed for so many years to realize the highest and the most intense of its joys :

'Too late have I sought thee thou Beauty, so ancient and so new,
too late have I sought thee.'

For William Wordsworth, not a twice-born saint, but the poet of Nature-Mysticism, this mystical worship is not less joyous and uplifting, though it is without the note of penitence :

I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts: a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.' (Tintern Abbey.)

It is necessary, however, to avert our gaze for a while from this higher kind of divine worship, and direct our attention to the many more primitive kinds of worship which have preceded the higher kind in the history of religion, bearing in mind Aristotle's great dictum that the true nature of a thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed. Hence it is not by study-

ing the origin and primitive stages of worship that we shall secure the truest understanding of its essential character. Nevertheless, some knowledge of the origins of worship and of its successive stages of development are needful for a right understanding of the significance of these latest and highest stages; for a living process is not rightly defined in terms of its origin. It must be defined in terms of its consummation. But its consummation is only rightly understood in the light of its origin and of its succeeding stages of process.

When we study religious worship as unveiled by the newest of our sciences, Anthropology, pre-eminently in Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough* and in its many sequent volumes, we are left in no doubt of the fact that primitive man, no less than his modern savage successors, is a worshipping being. Is there anything in the Universe which man has not worshipped? The grotesque objects of fetishism: the innumerable animals of totemism: the celestial luminaries of astrological religion: the zoomorphic deities of Egypt, half animal, half human: the purely anthropomorphic gods, perfect in their human loveliness in the Pantheon of Greece — natural objects, mechanical forces, political creations, vital powers in Nature and in Man, human personality in the king and the priest, the hero and the conqueror — all have been worshipped as divine and indeed still are, even in this modern world and in more cases than the worshippers themselves are aware of.

But the history of human religion, besides recording the innumerable objects of human worship and the manifold ways — grotesque, cruel, obscene, repulsive methods of worshipping them — which the past enshrines, also provides us with another aspect of the vitality and vigour of the worshipping spirit in man. The course of religious history is strewn with the wreckage of deposed, despised, and even hated deities. Why is this?

It is because religious worship is not quite as undiscerning and indiscriminating as the multiplicity of its deities and the manifold character of its *cultus* might suggest. There is a method in its madness, not easily discoverable, but yet there. There is a purpose prompting its action, and this exhibits itself in an evolution of religion accompanied by intermittent fits of

iconoclasm and atheism. The evidence of this religious evolution is seen in the new deities substituted for the old. This substitution is not solely due to man's desire for change. Religion, curiously enough, is both the most conservative and the most revolutionary thing in human history. And this is why the old religions, in the form of discredited superstitions or popular cults, often survive side by side with their nobler successors.

This religious evolution, like biological evolution, although man is a factor in it, yet seems to be determined or perhaps more correctly, inspired and guided, by forces outside man's control but which it is in his power personally to co-operate with, or to oppose. To withstand permanently the evolution of religion would not seem to be within man's power.

In the study of Comparative Religion, religious evolution is not clearly distinguishable. It is in the study of the History of Religion, particularly in the history of a great religion such as Hinduism or the Hebrew-Christian religion, that this evolution becomes clearly discernible. Our Bible is the best textbook that we possess for this purpose. Yet to recognize convincingly the stages of this religious evolution demands a serious training in literary and historical criticism and in the classification of religions. Although primitive Christians recognized that the religion of Israel was a preparation for the religion of Jesus Christ, the successive stages in the evolution of Israel's religion were not clearly perceived by Christian students until recent years, although it is of interest to note that some of the great Christian Fathers did recognize stages in the evolution of religion in the Pagan world. For instance, Clement of Alexandria was convinced that the worship of the heavenly bodies was a higher kind of religion than the worship of animals which had preceded it. He also saw the fulfilment of a Divine Purpose in the evolution of religion, and whilst he recognized that the religion of Israel was a preparation for the religion of Christ in the Semitic world, he was equally convinced that Greek philosophy was a preparation for the religion of Christ in the Hellenic world.

Yet, whilst the evolution of religion is clearly recognizable to-day by the student of the History of Religion, it would be a

mistake to jump to the conclusion that all movement in religion is forward and upward. There are other movements which are retrogressive and decadent. Moreover, the movement forward and upward is not in a straight line. It more closely resembles a helix or perhaps a succession of inverted cones each emerging from its predecessor. Furthermore, not one of the great religions is a pure and unadulterated product of the religious experience of a single race or community or individual. It is a mixed magnitude which has attracted to it and incorporated into it religious concepts and customs derived from many outside sources. The very pure worship of God which our English Reformers conceived of as offered to God by primal man before his Fall, comes not at the beginning of human history, but would appear to be the achievement and quintessence of a long course of religious evolution.²

The history of religion is a very complicated affair and, if we view it in short periods, a very disheartening affair. It presents its student with so many crises in which the higher and the lower struggle together for the mastery and in which oftentimes the higher is for a while defeated. Nevertheless, there is not only a higher and a lower in the sphere of religious worship and practice, but there is also enough testimony derivable from the long history of religion to justify a good hope that the highest will in the end prevail. The Frenchman who summed up the history of religious evolution in three words—polytheism, monotheism, atheism—achieved simplicity at the cost of truth. Neither religious faith nor religious worship, which is the expression of religious faith, end in that way. There is a dark night of the soul: indeed many of them, in the history of religion, but this is not its last experience: it emerges into a new dawn.

If religion be the most conservative and the most revolutionary thing in human history, it is also the most vital thing, as is shown by its amazing power of survival: but survival often in a new and not easily recognizable form. It is in the study of

² Some modern Catholic anthropologists who appear to be more intent on securing evidence in support of traditional Christian views than in purely scientific research would dispute this conclusion.

religious convictions, expressed particularly in the history of prayer, that we are best able to trace the evolution of religion. This is the cordial for drooping spirits whose survey of religion tempts them to the conclusion that it is all a hopeless enigma.

Everywhere the roads begin
And people walk with zeal therein,
But wher'soe'er the highways tend
Be sure there's nothing at the end.

Dr. Marrett's little essay, *From Spell to Prayer*, Heiler's great book, *Das Gebet*, the comparison of Kenneth Henderson's *Prayers of Citizenship*, with the incantations and ritual hymns of the more primitive cults of the ancient world, provide a convincing impression of the reality of religious evolution. This religious evolution is marked by three co-operative movements.

(1) Worship passes upward from the many to the One whether in Israel or in Greece or in India. Although the One may differ in attributes—it may be deistic or monotheistic or pantheistic, sub-personal, personal or supra-personal—yet it is always one and the attitude of the worshipper is that expressed in the verse of the Indian sage :

I am oh Lord of Thee
Not Thou of me,
As of the sea is verily the wave
Not of the wave, the sea.

(2) Worship passes upward from the material, the tangible, that which can be perceived by the senses, to that which is imperceptible except by man's higher faculties. This non-material element may be regarded as underlying all things or as transcending them or as interfusing them or as existing in all three modes together : nevertheless it is spiritual, not material.

(3) Man, the worshipper, becomes the measure of his Deity. Man comes to believe himself to be created in the image of God. Man finds his place at the head of creation, subject only to the Deity in whose likeness he is created and whose life he shares. The great hymn of creation with which *Genesis* opens is not only the *Magna Carta* of monotheism, it is also the *Magna Carta* of the rights and dignity of man. The Creator proclaims it in the words : Let us make man in our image, after our likeness : let them have dominion . . . over all the earth (*Gen.* i, 26).

He who accepts this religious evolution as an ascent into the truth of things is compelled as a consequence to regard man as occupying a position of supreme importance in the known creative process with no superior except its creator whose nature he shares. He acknowledges with Sir Thomas Browne in the *Religio Medici*:

'There is surely a piece of divinity in us: something that was before the elements, and owes no homage unto the sun.'

In the light of this religious evolution, all man's former objects of worship are seen to be subhuman, things of less worth than man himself. Henceforth in the sphere of religion, nothing may intervene between God and mankind with one exception—the Ideal Man. This Ideal Man may, like Plato's ideas, exist only in the heavens as the Divine Ideal of man. For the Christian the Divine Ideal has been realized in human history in the personality of Jesus Christ—*homo perfectus* or *deitas sub specie humanitatis*—Perfect Man as seen from the point of view of the evolutionary process, or, as seen from the point of view of the transcendent and eternal, God under the limitation of humanity.

This justification for worship of Jesus Christ derived from an examination of religious evolution will be condemned by some as sheer anthropomorphism which ought to find no place in the highest kind of religion. The charge that it is anthropomorphic is not, however, a sound reason for its condemnation and rejection provided the anthropomorphism be of the higher, not of the lower kind, *i.e.* the anthropomorphism which does not conceive of God as a physically magnified man, but conceives of God as possessing in an infinite degree those rational, moral, and spiritual qualities which constitute the essential human nature in man in contrast with the brutish or animal condition from which he has with so much struggle emerged.

Dean W. R. Matthews, like other students of theology who have been influenced in their theological studies by the scientific inductive method, would certainly seem to agree with my argument here put forth. In his valuable volume, *God in Christian Thought and Experience*, he writes:

'Anthropomorphism is the road along which the believing mind has travelled from superstition to noble creeds. The fact is not surprising. An anthropomorphic religion has at least taken the step of

postulating that the power on which we depend is not lower than ourselves and has admitted at the same time the principle of progress. For man is the deepest mystery of the world. He alone has the potentiality of infinite development' (p. 31).

'It is only as man comes to know himself that he is able to catch a glimpse of the nature of the Other with whom he continually dwells, and by contact with whom he acquires self-knowledge. The two fundamental maxims of Greek and Hebrew aspiration respectively, 'know thyself' and 'know God,' are not contradictory but complementary, for man knows God in so far as he truly knows himself and he knows himself through knowing God' (p. 34).

In this paper I have treated the Christian worship of Jesus Christ only from the standpoint of a modern scientific student of Religion and the justification for that worship to which such studies point. In a subsequent paper I hope to deal with some other aspects of the worship of Jesus Christ in relation to Christian history, experience and dogma.

IN MEMORIAM

EDWARD PERCY BOYS-SMITH

A deeply revered member has been lost to the Modern Churchmen's Union by the death of the Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith on November 20 at the age of 79. Educated at Sherborne and St. John's College, Cambridge, he was ordained in 1886. After holding several curacies in the Winchester Diocese, he became Vicar of Hordle, where he remained for forty years. In 1927 he was appointed Rural Dean of Lyndhurst in the New Forest. A faithful and beloved pastor, respected by his fellow-clergy,

'Along the cool sequester'd vale of life
He kept the noiseless tenour of his way.'

Graduation in the Moral Sciences Tripos, by opening his mind and clearing his mental vision, enabled him to become an enlightened student and teacher of the Christian religion. Many years ago he became a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union and was assiduous and most helpful in his attendance at our annual conferences.

The following appreciation expresses admirably the character of his influence in the Church circles in which he moved :

SIR,

As a member for many years of the local Bournemouth and District Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union, I desire to pay a last tribute of

gratitude and respect to our late Chairman, the Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith. Those of us who had the privilege to hear him summing up the discussion will always remember his fitly-chosen words to express thought clearly grasped. We were inspired by his fearless devotion to truth and his simple humility before the mystery of God.

Personally, I am deeply grateful for his constructive teaching on the Holy Communion, clearly expressed in the October *Modern Churchman*. In the days when altars are desecrated and burnt with fire, the call comes to recognize that the vital point is 'the consecration of living persons who are brought by faith into a communion of life with their Lord and enabled to share in that heroic life to which He consecrated Himself.'

The last time I met him was at our M.C. meeting in September, 1939, when he rebuked me in a fatherly spirit for my impatience with Fundamentalists and other Christians who cling to 'infallibilities.' Characteristically, he said that he was glad to have lived to see the modern outlook applied to the Old Testament by most educated Christians; he hoped I might live to see this extended to the New Testament, but we must leave it to the generation yet unborn to work this transfiguration into their conception of the Church. Yet, with all due deference, I am impatient still.

22 Studland Road, Bournemouth.

URSULA WELLS, S.Th.-L.T.

BOOK REVIEWS

PHILO AND ST. JOHN*

Amid so many larger books on the Fourth Gospel, both new and old, Dr. Bury's slim war-time volume is in many ways very refreshing. It has the classical scholarly approach, and to support its thesis it examines the evidence in the Fourth Gospel and other relevant works, weighs it, and then states its conclusions without forcing the author into a preconceived mould more familiar to modern days than to the century in which the author wrote. The purpose of the book is declared in the Foreword to be

'to exhibit, as concisely as possible, the extent to which the Author is imbued with the spirit of the curious blend of Judaism and Hellenism, the Philonian philosophy,'

and we are warned at the start that the writer assumes 'the integral connexion of the Prologue with the rest of the Gospel.'

The book begins with a very clear and useful review of Logos-philosophy from Heraclitus to Justin, including therein a brief survey of the kindred Hebrew Wisdom Literature and of the prophetic use of the expression 'the Word of the Lord.' Naturally most attention in this section is devoted to Philo, whose philosophy he describes as

'of a composite and eclectic character, borrowing elements from Platonism, Aristotelianism and Stoicism, and attempting to harmonise them with Hebrew monotheism.'

Dr. Bury shows how Philo's God, who was Infinite and Unknowable and

* *The Fourth Gospel and the Logos Doctrine*. By R. G. Bury, Litt.D. (Heffer, Cambridge, 1940. 4s. 6d.)

Absolute Being devoid of all quality (τὸ ὄν, ἄποιος), created and ruled the universe by intermediaries, which are variously called Powers (Δυνάμεις) or archetypal Ideas according to whether Philo is thinking in terms of physical forces or of Platonic metaphysics. But for Philo all these Powers or Ideas are summed up in the Logos which unites in itself all efficient causes and all intellectual forms. This Logos, the highest term next to the Absolute, is the Ἰδέα τῶν Ἰδέων, through which all other causes or Forms exist. It is of course the Law, the Divine Word, shaping all things, and the Logos Tomeus ('the Cutter') which differentiates all created things into kinds. But this Logos as God's subjective thought is also objectively 'planted out' in the world, and so we get also many logoi both as the principles of things or rational laws of evolution and as special precepts of Divine Law in Ethics or ideals of virtue.

Dr. Bury goes on to trace particular applications of this doctrine, especially noticing how Philo explained theophanies in the Old Testament as logophanies. He regards 'the Angel of the Lord' as the Logos, and makes characters like Abraham, Melchisedek, Aaron and Moses types or symbols—we might almost say 'incarnations'—of the Logos. The Logos is also called Interpreter (ἐρμηνευτής), Paraclete, Envoy (πρεσβευτής) and Suppliant (ἱκέτης) which, Dr. Bury rightly notes, imply that the Logos is a personal being.

In this connexion it is interesting to observe that the Patriarchs, who are regarded by Philo as the Logos 'incarnate,' are especially called ἀρχηγέται, although this title is not actually cited by Dr. Bury, and that a similar word (ἀρχηγός) was one of the primitive titles of Christ (*Acts* iii, 15; v, 31; *Heb.* ii, 10; xii, 1-2; for ἀρχηγός = ἀρχηγέτης, cf. LXX *Ex.* vi, 14; *Num.* x, 4; xxv, 4). This is especially interesting in view of the fact that Dr. Bury, in his section showing how John followed Philo point by point, merely putting the historical Christ for the Logos (p. 9f.) says among other things that

'For John, as well as Philo and the Stoics, the Divine Logos utters itself or pluralises itself in a number of specific logoi—amongst which we must include especially the seven "I am's" of Christ's discourses; and these fractional logoi are regarded by John also as not merely words but living forces.' . . . 'Philo regarded the Theophanies of the O.T. as Logophanies: so apparently does John: at any rate he treats the whole life of Jesus as a Logophany, parallel to that of the Shechinah in the Tabernacle.'

Having dealt with the Logos Doctrine, Dr. Bury with admirable brevity gives an analysis and summary of the contents of the Fourth Gospel, discusses its structure and style, describes its use of allegory and symbolism, and outlines its relation with the Synoptics. The section on symbolism is most interesting for its examination, in the light of similar familiar doctrines in Philo, of the mystical significance in the Fourth Gospel of numbers like seven and terms like 'Israel' or 'Israelite,' interpreted as 'seeing' or

'seer of God.' Finally, the author concludes his introduction with a note on the identity of the evangelist. He was, he thinks, probably 'a Jew of Alexandria, a learned man and mighty in the Scriptures,' and he probably lived about the end of the first century.

In the succinct, detailed Notes on the Gospel which follow, Dr. Bury most usefully quotes Philonic and Old Testament parallels and traces in detail the development of the conceptions and themes of the Prologue throughout the Gospel. The rationing of newsprint has made impossible quotations *in extenso*, but perhaps this is a blessing in disguise, for the conciseness seems to make the points clearer and more forcible. We may perhaps be excused if we find ourselves hesitating as to whether, in certain cases, the same mystical allegorizing symbolism are really to be found in the Gospel where Dr. Bury suggests Philonic parallels. Can we, for example, believe that 'my father's house' in *John* xiv, 2 means 'the Logos' in spite of the quotations from Philo *ad loc.* (p. 60)? But whether one wholly accepts Dr. Bury's approach to the Fourth Gospel through Philo or not, his book will be found permanently useful for its references and parallels, and stimulating theories.

W. RICHARDSON.

WISHFUL THINKING AND REVERENT AGNOSTICISM *

The beliefs of the Jewish apocalyptic writers about the resurrection of the body and the future life are now part of the common stock of theological students. *Enoch* and *IV Esdras* have been quoted almost *ad nauseam*. Few of such writings have any literary merit. They mostly turn what might have been of value as poetical material into rather bizarre matter of fact. The authors had not that profound gift of imagination which was granted to the writers of *The Apocalypse* of John and of *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. It is useful, however, to have them all summarized in relation both to what went before and what followed after. Dr. Pilcher has not only done this; he has also given useful information concerning the views of the Rabbinical writers, whose works are far less generally known. Not that the bizarre and even the ridiculous are absent from *Midrash* and *Talmud*. Far from it. Dr. Pilcher quotes passages which state, for example, that at the Messianic Feast the skin of Leviathan will be spread over the Holy City for shade, and 'Every Sabbath the Israelites arrive at the Temple to worship God, riding on clouds.' Rabbi Meir 'invented another deadly sin—to have a theological college . . . in your city and not attend it.'

But the historical importance of the Rabbinical writings, as bearing especially on the New Testament, is brought out well by Dr. Pilcher, in some instances especially which have not been sufficiently noticed.

* *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought*, with special reference to the Doctrine of the Resurrection (the Moorhouse Lectures, 1938), by C. V. Pilcher, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1940. 7s. 6d.

The salutary warning of 'It is not for you to know times or seasons . . . ' is shown in its full significance when we read of the elaborate calculation of the 'Days of the Messiah,' the 'World Sabbath' and the like which the Rabbis took over from the Apocalyptists and worked out with infinite waste of time and labour which might have been devoted to more spiritual thought and study.

The 'sins that have no forgiveness' are especially illuminating. Rabbi Aqiba's were 'denial of the Resurrection, denial of the divine origin of the Torah, and a devotion to free thought.' Most interesting are the anticipations, which we find in a Rabbinical writing, of the later Catholic doctrine of Purgatory and the means of release from it: 'It might be supposed that when a man has gone down to Gehenna no escape is possible for him. But if someone prays for mercy on his soul, he shoots him out of Gehenna like an arrow from a bow.'

Dr. Pilcher sums up his chapter on The Kingdom of God with these words: 'All the various ideas' (in the Jewish Eschatology of the Kingdom) 'are based on the conviction that history moves under the guidance and judgment of God.' No doubt. But there is little value in that conviction if the issue of history is regarded from a point of view which is indistinguishable from mere wishful thinking, especially when it mainly envisages the destruction of the nation's enemies, or a rather unspiritual reward of the faithful. These ideas were only too frequent in the writings referred to, and they exercised a baleful influence on Christian thought which it has never completely shaken off.

In his treatment of the problem of the Resurrection and the Future Life in the New Testament and in patristic writings Dr. Pilcher is mainly concerned to contrast (1) St. Paul's view of the 'spiritual body' with more material views, and (2) the idea of an intermediate state, followed by a final resurrection, with that which envisages the immediate entry of the soul on death to its final destiny. He vigorously supports St. Paul's view on (1), and rejects the idea of an intermediate state, which was itself derived from Rabbinical sources.

He supports Origen's contention that in the spiritual body 'we shall be all hearing, all sight, all action, all movement' (rather than needing any organs of perception, etc.). But that thought needs much consideration. The higher faculties of man have been attained by an evolutionary process of differentiation. It is the amoeba that is all hearing, all sight, etc. There may be a higher meaning to such terms, but they almost suggest that no body is needed at all. Not that one should not be thankful to the great Alexandrian, who in this as in so many other theological points has raised the common level of thought so far. But is it not perhaps better, on this point, to adopt the attitude which the author takes up towards the question of the ultimate salvation of all—one of 'reverent agnosticism'?

In treating of the question 'Where are the departed?' can Dr. Pilcher be right in stating that to St. Paul 'heaven is not primarily a place but a state'? For him it was surely quite definitely 'beyond the clouds.' Moreover, we cannot imagine a non-spatial 'state' of existence; though it may be helpful to recall F. H. Bradley's interesting speculation that there may be worlds that have no spatial or temporal relation to one another at all, and are yet related to one another in the absolute.

I used the term 'wishful thinking.' It is perhaps to be regretted that the scope of the lectures did not admit any discussion of this aspect of the problem, for, on the apologetic side, the Christian theologian must nowadays regard it as his primary duty to defend the Doctrine of The Life Everlasting against the accusation that it belongs to that category. For example, Christian and Jewish eschatologists alike have always assumed that 'there will be no more pain' in heaven. But if pain in this present world can be brought into a Divine scheme, which is ultimately to be seen as good by 'them that love God,' is it so certain that *all* kinds of pain will be totally eliminated even in heaven? Perhaps, however, here also 'reverent agnosticism' is the better attitude.

GUY KENDALL.

IS CHRISTIANITY JUST?*

'The Christian religion is a religion of two Testaments, in which the Old though fulfilled is never destroyed, nor ever completely absorbed by the New.'

Canon Quick compares the principles of the two Testaments, of the Old, justice, of the New, love. His small and most valuable book is of permanent and also topical interest. The larger part shows the relation between justice and love as principles of daily life. In practice, justice comes first. One must be just before one may be generous. One must pay one's debts before giving to charity. But from the metaphysical standpoint love is primary. Man has a right to justice because he is a child of God. In the language of Kant, every man should be treated as an end, not as a means. Love also has an evangelical power which justice is without. Our hearts are not touched when we receive simply what is our due. But love that gives us so much more than we expect or deserve can inspire our gratitude and stir our souls. 'One loving soul sets other souls on fire.' Justice and love are the guiding principles of Christian conduct, and Canon Quick's book helps one to understand how they supplement each other in every wise and good life.

His book also has a topical interest. It has been written while we are at war, fighting, as we believe, in the cause of justice and righteousness. Canon Quick has had this in mind, and what he says about justice and war

* *Christianity and Justice*, by O. C. Quick. (Sheldon Press. 1/-, 1940.)

helps one to understand some of the rights and wrongs of the present conflict. But just here the philosopher sometimes misleads the practical man. He asks

'if it is possible to win a great war without using methods which are fatal to justice.' 'If the impossibility exists, then the war is better lost than won.' 'A belligerent State, which claims to fight justly, must always look forward to the resumption of friendly relations with its enemy, as soon as the restraint (on the enemy) which the war aims at has been achieved. . . . It ought not to employ any methods of war which are primarily directed towards destroying the morale of the enemy population. The use of such methods cannot be justified by way of reprisal. . . . When once a war has become simply the attempt of one State to vanquish another by any and every means, it has become by that fact utterly unjust and wrong.'

Canon Quick would say that although the Nazis bomb civilians in London, we must not do the same in Berlin. Rather than this, as just men we should prefer to lose the war. It is hard to see how justice would be vindicated by a Nazi victory. Various misconceptions seem to have led Canon Quick to this surprising conclusion. First, this is total war, a war in which not only the fighting men but the whole population is engaged. Hitler hopes to win by demoralizing the people of London, so as to make them ask for peace at any price. If our only chance of winning was to make the people of Berlin, Munich and Hamburg do the same we should have to copy his methods. Secondly, the rules of reprisals are different in International Law from what Canon Quick lays down. If one belligerent breaks a convention of war, the other may do the same, supposing that the second break is roughly equivalent to the first. This is the principle of an eye for an eye. Its consequences are likely to be grim for everyone, but how can a war against Hitler be anything else? Thirdly, Canon Quick lays it down that nations at war must remember that after war will come peace, and they should not use methods of warfare which cause permanent embitterment between nations. This is sound advice, but it is not easily applied in the present conflict. At any rate we are agreed that we can never make peace with Hitler. The policy of appeasement had a long trial and was proved ineffective. Such a keen observer as Herr Haffner in his book *Germany Jekyll and Hyde* shows that there can never be peace in Europe till the Nazis are entirely suppressed. And this can only be achieved by force, for they believe in nothing else. Doubtless there are many Germans who are not Nazis. But with all the German nation the argument of force has too much weight, and justice too little.

Christians dislike the use of force, and some feel it to be wrong. This is one cause for their reluctance to go to war. But force is no more than an instrument of government, and whether it is right or wrong depends on how and why it is used. In war as in everything else one must distinguish between means and ends. Although it is a principle which has been much

abused, yet the end does justify the means. The Jews who fought Antiochus Epiphanes for their religion determined they must break the Sabbath Law and fight if they were attacked on the Sabbath. Total war is a grim business, but to refuse to use it in such reprisals as are needful for victory would not be to establish justice, but to hand the world over to the wickedness of Hitler.

It is the function of philosophers to discover and to formulate abstract principles. Their abstract principles are of the greatest value, but men of affairs are often the best judges of how to apply them wisely. Canon Quick has given us a fine study of justice and love, the two principles which guide all Christian conduct. Not to agree with all his applications does not destroy the permanent value of his book.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

CANON STORR: AN APPRECIATION.

SIR,

May one who was for three years a member of the Abbey congregation add a few words to your beautiful tribute to the late Canon Vernon Storr?

I always looked forward to the time when he was 'in residence': he would generally take some great Christian doctrine and preach a course of sermons upon it. Canon Storr had in a remarkable degree the gift of clear exposition, and his pulpit teaching was always such as a layman unfamiliar with technical theological terms could understand. The deep attention with which the large congregation listened to his sermons was in itself a tribute to his powers. And his preaching in the Abbey and elsewhere was only a part of the great work that Canon Storr accomplished as a Christian teacher. Some have lamented the fact that he published no book in his later years on the same scale as his *Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*; he probably achieved far more, however, by writing small books in simple language which were model expositions of the Christian Faith in the light of modern knowledge. I have always kept several copies of *My Faith* on my shelves, and I can vouch for the help which they have been to those to whom I have given them. Only a deeply learned and thoughtful man with a childlike faith and singleness of mind could have preached as he preached, and written as he wrote.

Canon Storr was deeply attached to the Abbey, and I do not think that I ever heard him speak at a conference or meeting without mentioning the great church and its worship. He was a definite Evangelical, but he loved the stately English ceremonial that has been a distinguishing feature of the Abbey services in recent years, and he believed that Evangelicals had much to learn in that sphere. The introduction of a Sung Eucharist is sometimes deplored, but I once heard Canon Storr say that such a service was increasingly appreciated, especially by young people. His place as a teacher will be hard to fill.

A. G. COOKE.

86 Colemeadow Road, Billesley, Birmingham 14.